

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 15-18, 20-22, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Since claims 15-18, 20-22, and 24-25 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 15-18, 20-22, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Jimarez (US 6,194,667). Since claims 15-18 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 15, 20-22, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Barrow (US 6,118,182). Since claims 15-18, 20-22, and 24-25 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 15, 20-22, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is moot.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(e) rejections of claim 14 with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as allegedly being anticipated by Jimarez (US 6,194,667).

Applicants respectfully contend that Jimarez does not anticipate claim 14, because Jimarez does not teach each and every feature of claim 14. For example, Jimarez does not teach "said openings having an oblong shape, an oval shape, or an elliptical shape". As another example, Jimarez does not teach "wherein the first dimension is greater than the second dimension, and wherein the first dimension of the openings is selectively oriented on the substrate in a direction of highest stress within each interconnection".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Jimarez does not anticipate claim 14, and that claim 14 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 27-38 depend from claim 14, Applicants contend that claims 27-38 are likewise in condition for allowance.

As to new claim 39, Applicants respectfully contend that Jimarez does not anticipate claim 39, because Jimarez does not teach each and every feature of claim 39. For example, Jimarez does not teach "wherein the mask has a plurality of non-circular openings having a first dimension larger than a diameter of the conductive pad, and a second dimension smaller than the diameter of the conductive pad".

Also as to new claim 39, Applicants respectfully contend that Barrow (US 6,118,182) does not anticipate claim 39, because Barrow does not teach each and every feature of claim 39. For example, Barrow does not teach "a substrate having a plurality of **circular** conductive pads

and a mask thereon" (emphasis added). Applicants note that Barrow's pads have a rectangular shape (see Barrow, col. 1, lines 57-59; col. 2, line 19).

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that neither Jimarez nor Barrow anticipates claim 39, and that claim 39 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 40-51 depend from claim 39, Applicants contend that claims 40-51 are likewise in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 01/06/2004

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688